

Basin Study Work Group Meeting
January 27, 2014, 1-4 PM, DeArmond Room Deschutes County Admin Building, Bend, OR

ATTENDING

Mike Britton, North Unit Irrigation District
Suzanne Butterfield, Swalley Irrigation District
Joy Cooper, GSI
Tom Davis, Deschutes Reintroduction Network
Dave Dunahay, Central Oregon Flyfishers
Kate Fitzpatrick, Deschutes River Conservancy
Chris Gannon, Crooked River Watershed Council
(by phone)
Kyle Gorman, Oregon Water Resources
Department
Jason Gritzner, USDA Forest Service
Tod Heisler, Deschutes River Conservancy
Brett Hodgson, Oregon Department of Fish and
Wildlife

Bill Hopp, Tumalo Irrigation District
Danielle MacBain, GSI
Mark Reinecke, Bryant, Lovlien and Jarvis
representing Avion
Ken Rieck, Tumalo Irrigation District
Betty Roppe, Central Oregon Cities
Organization; City of Prineville
Adam Sussman, GSI
Pamela Thalacker, Three Sisters Irrigation
District
Mike Tripp, Trout Unlimited
Alan Unger, Deschutes County
Jeff Wieland, Upper Deschutes River Coalition

Mary Orton of The Mary Orton Company, LLC attended as facilitator.

AGENDA

The group used the following agenda as a guide during their meeting:

1. Welcome
2. Check-in
3. Review and approval of previous meetings
4. Reports from subgroups
5. Update on communications with Reclamation
6. Report on state funding
7. Development of Basin Study Proposal to Reclamation
8. Revisiting structure and decision-making discussion
9. Next steps
10. Meeting Evaluation
11. Adjourn

Due to time constraints, the group did not address agenda item #8, "Revisiting structure and decision-making discussion."

WELCOME AND CHECK-IN

Suzanne Butterfield welcomed everybody to the meeting. She explained that the main agenda item of the day was making progress on the Proposal for the Basin Study, and cautioned that the group is time- and resource-limited. Thus, she encouraged attendees to focus on what is needed for the Proposal phase. All comments will be documented, and the more specific ones will be carried over to the Plan of Study discussions. Participants were asked to check-in.

REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES

Because minutes from January 7 and January 16 were just distributed this morning, the group asked to finalize the minutes at the next meeting. The December 12 meeting notes were approved as distributed by consensus with all green cards.

REPORTS FROM SUBGROUPS

Crooked River Subgroup

Subgroup Chair Mayor Roppe gave the update, [Attachment 1](#). It was noted that Dan Bruce represents the Terrebonne Domestic Water District.

Deschutes Instream Subgroup

Subgroup Chair Ryan Houston was unable to attend and requested that Kate read the subgroup's update as follows:

The Instream Subgroup has continued working on defining the studies necessary to better define instream flow necessary to meet specific ecological objectives. To date, the group has identified the need to re-run PHABSIM (a fish habitat model) as well as some HEC-RAS (hydraulic model to address floodplain inundation). The group is meeting on Tuesday 1/28 to look more closely at water quality related studies so there will be a recommendation for that subject as well.

The group is working up estimated costs for these studies and is in the process of drafting these recommendations in a memo to BSWG. This should be done in a couple weeks, which will still allow plenty of time to fine tune these studies for inclusion in the Plan of Study.

Suzanne asked how subgroup work gets incorporated in the Proposal and/or Plan of Study. Kate said that high-level direction from the subgroups has been added to the Proposal (through Kate communicating with GSI). More detailed input will be incorporated as we develop the Plan of Study. Subgroups will forward recommendations to BSWG.

UPDATE ON COMMUNICATIONS WITH RECLAMATION

Suzanne reported that there is a conference call set up for Thursday with Lynn Holt, Doug DeFlicht, and Dawn Weidmeier from Reclamation. Adam will generate an agenda. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the process and ask some specific questions, like timeline and how much money BOR estimates they will need for climate analysis. The group will not be discussing a draft proposal.

Adam does want to get a draft Proposal in front of BOR as soon as possible, as the local personnel have offered to review it and help improve it. He will send them a draft this Friday. They will try to get comments back by February 3 or 4.

REPORT ON STATE FUNDING

No significant updates on state funding. Adam clarified that the Willamette is not applying for a Basin Study. They are completing a smaller-scale "Plan of Study" (a preliminary step to a Basin Study) to clarify agricultural demand. They will use the SB 839 money to match Federal investment in the Army Corps of Engineers Reallocation Study.

DEVELOPMENT OF BASIN STUDY PROPOSAL

Adam prefaced the process by recommending staying at a high, thematic level, and said Mike Tripp's comments were a good example of that. GSI can incorporate these themes throughout the proposal. It

is difficult to edit by committee at too fine a level of detail; plus, detail is not needed at this stage. He said that Mary would document comments that the group can revisit for Plan of Study development.

Following are the comments made and the discussion and disposition of each.

- **Explore opportunities to increase storage to meet current and future demands.**
- **Off-channel storage: could we reference BOR's 1972 study that identified the Monner Reservoir site as a lead-in to this section of the proposal?**

The group agreed to look at supply-side opportunities to increase storage for existing and future demands. Kate will send Adam an excerpt from the BOR 1972 report to be used as an example.

Consensus: all green cards.

Tod acknowledged that by throwing every option in at this point, we are putting off hard decisions for later. The group agreed that this was appropriate now, and understands that prioritization will need to happen later for the Plan of Study.

- **Nothing should be inconsistent with compromise language in Crooked River legislation.**
- **Take out the flatwater "demand" number behind Bowman Dam.**
- **Treat recreation more comprehensively to include all water-related uses (fishing, kayaking, reservoir use).**

There was discussion about removing the flatwater recreation "demand" behind Bowman Dam. Kimberley and Dave expressed concerns about referencing flatwater demands in a way that conflicts with the compromise language reached as part of the Merkley bill for the Crooked River legislation. Kate suggested saying that water management changes have potential impacts to reservoir levels, instead of identifying flatwater recreation as a specific known demand. Betty was uncomfortable taking out the number because it was the last number identified. Kate clarified that that number came from a different process than the DWA studies that generated all of the other demand numbers in the proposal. It was a number flatwater recreation interests generated as part of one of Reclamation's reallocation efforts in the 1980s and is correlated to reservoir levels and boat dock access. Kyle suggested taking the number out; the important thing is to capture that at some level the boat docks are too low and hinder recreation. Mike Britton agreed to taking the number out. Brett Hodgson suggested describing recreation more comprehensively to cover all sorts of water-related recreation in the basin, which extends beyond Prineville Reservoir to all of the reservoirs and river reaches. Betty said she could not agree with taking out any reference to flatwater, and nor could Kyle. It was suggested to change "flatwater" to "in-reservoir use or recreation," acknowledging the semantics change won't address the substantive concerns. Mary asked the group if they liked the suggestion of making it more comprehensive to include in-reservoir use or recreation and angling, kayaking, etc. Chris suggested the language "water-related recreation and aesthetics."

Dave was concerned about what they were doing with the proposal since so many partners at this table finally came to a compromise agreement with the Crooked River legislation. Danielle identified two areas in the proposal where Reclamation requires that recreation at Reclamation facilities be addressed. Dave suggested keeping it high-level and general, with nothing that would reference undoing the compromise. Chris thought the legislation and compromises have little to do with this process. The study by itself doesn't take actions or force us to make decisions. Mark concurred, and said he didn't think it would invalidate the compromise. Mike Britton agreed. Bill Hopp suggested taking the focus off Prineville Reservoir since the group was considering all reservoirs.

The group agreed to let Danielle and Adam redraft this language, with direction to remove the Prineville Reservoir number and speak about recreation more comprehensively, to refer to “water-related recreation and aesthetics” as opposed to “flatwater recreation,” and include “in-reservoir use” or “in-reservoir recreation.” **Consensus: All green cards.**

- **Questions about how we are articulating groundwater demand in the Proposal. Precision is critical to the study to get the right outputs.**
- **Clarify how we are refining current demand numbers as part of study (specifically instream and groundwater).**

There is not agreement on the appropriate number to use for groundwater demand in the Proposal. Kyle mentioned that the Groundwater Subgroup met once, and more issues arose than he had expected. He said Mary and Kate encouraged him to convene the group again after the Proposal went in, as agreement on any refinement of numbers wasn't critical for the proposal. There was also a suggestion to acknowledge that the instream and groundwater demand numbers will be refined during the Basin Study and that should be more explicit throughout the proposal.

A recent USGS update on the groundwater study was mentioned. Kyle said OWRD granted money to further refine the existing model, focused on the discharge areas of the basin such as the Metolius, but that study is just beginning now. Adam reminded us that the DWPI/DWA studies have numbers cited in the proposal. Just like Jason said 160K is just to meet state instream water rights, and that may not be enough, there are several numbers that need to be refined by the study. The groundwater number is the same. Tod suggested that we need to identify a precise number that is based on documented and defensible existing demand (i.e., municipal groundwater permits, which would be closer to 5,000 AF), while leaving a buffer for the unknown. Adam suggested it is important to acknowledge and to plan for the entire amount of groundwater development that is legal under the 200 cfs cap. More work can be done in the Subgroup to work towards agreement on the groundwater demand number.

For the purposes of the Proposal, Kate suggested, and the group agreed, to cite the 15K allowable under the groundwater mitigation program and acknowledging this number will be refined to estimate non-speculative demand over the designated planning horizon. In addition, the Proposal will say that all of the demand numbers will be assessed and refined where necessary. Finally, Adam will decide whether to include reference to the OWRD groundwater study being initiated. **Consensus: all green cards.**

- **Highlight flood control as a clear and present danger in Whychus Creek (and Tumalo).**

Pamela and Adam suggested, and the group agreed, to add flood control in Whychus and Tumalo Creeks as an issue. **Consensus: all green cards.**

- **Add Crook County, Crooked River Watershed Council, and the City of Prineville to the list of BSWG members on page 4.**

The group agreed to include Crook County, Crooked River Watershed Council, and the City of Prineville on as BSWG members (inadvertently omitted). **Consensus: all green cards.**

- **If LIDAR is going to be used there should be some reference to where it's been used before and how much it costs. Don't overestimate how detailed it can be.**

Jeff noted the Deschutes Instream subgroup has already been working on this.

The group agreed that gathering more information about how LIDAR has been used in other basins is a level of detail more applicable to the Plan of Study. **Consensus: all green cards.**

The group took a 5-minute break.

- **Economics of an improved fishery could be major return on investment for the work we want to do; we should highlight this.**

Suzanne cautioned against committing to spending money on this. Kate noted that DRC, Trout Unlimited and VisitBend are initiating a study on the economic impacts of the Upper Deschutes River on tourism and recreation.

Tod agreed, and suggested bringing together all of the available economic information by sector as justification for this work. **Consensus: all green cards.**

- **USGS climate study published groundwater input into streams. Waibel et al., 2013.**

Mike Tripp agreed to send the Waibel study on climate change impacts on groundwater systems in the Deschutes to Adam for inclusion in the Proposal (pages 15-16). **Consensus: all green cards.**

- **Confirm DBBC address to use.**

Danielle confirmed that the right address to use is Redmond.

- **Change low flows in summer to cover a broader range of flow limiting conditions on p. 5.**

The group agreed to change “low flows in summer and winter” to “flow challenges at different times of the year.” **Consensus: all green cards.**

- **There are multiple references to hydropower development, but we should be explicit that hydro is not a water supply driver; it is a secondary use in most cases).**

Brett expressed discomfort characterizing hydropower as a supply issue. He was operating with the understanding that the BSWG was focused on the three sectors of water use – agriculture, municipal, and instream demands. There was broad agreement that existing and future hydropower was a secondary use of the water, not a stand-alone demand on water supplies (the COID siphon may be slightly different), and that water management planning can have economic impacts and opportunities. Danielle noted that the BOR criteria require reference to hydropower several times. Several people noted the synergistic opportunities between flow and hydropower projects (i.e., revenue generation); water quality and hydropower synergy (i.e., hydro on Bowman could reduce total dissolved gas issues and gas bubble disease in fish); and that hydropower projects often fund conservation projects and fish passage projects. Others noted it would be important to acknowledge the negative impacts if the hydropower supply were reduced. The group clarified that “in-conduit” should be used instead of “pipeline” or “in-line.” Danielle reviewed the two hydropower references in the proposal. Brett said he could live with them, as long as they are referenced as a secondary use.

The group agreed to include the potential for hydropower at Bowman and Wickiup, and the potential for water quality improvement at Bowman; some language about the synergistic benefits of hydropower, and to cite the success of the Oregon statute in facilitating small in-conduit hydropower.

Consensus: all green cards.

NEXT STEPS

The group discussed next steps under a short timeframe to finalize the Proposal for submittal by February 14, and agreed on the following.

Who	What	By When
All persons on the BSWG mailing list	Send any additional comments on the "70% draft proposal" to Adam Sussman (ASussman@gsiws.com) and Danielle MacBain (DMacBain@gsiws.com), cc: Kate Fitzpatrick (kate@deschutesriver.org) and Mary Orton (Mary@maryorton.com).	Wednesday, January 29, or earlier if possible.
Adam, Suzanne Butterfield, Steve Johnson, and Kate	Conference call with Reclamation to talk about some big-picture questions.	Thursday, January 30
Adam and Danielle	Send an updated draft proposal, including all the changes agreed to today, to Reclamation and the BSWG mailing list for review. (Note: This is not an official submittal to Reclamation; they offered to review and offer feedback to the draft.)	Friday, January 31
Reclamation	Return comments on the revised draft.	They think they can return comments by February 3 or 4
All persons on the BSWG mailing list	Send to Adam, Danielle, Kate, and Mary the details of any significant issues you may have with the revised draft. Please do not only point out problems; <i>also please suggest revised wording that would address your concerns.</i>	February 4
GSI	Create the final draft proposal that incorporates the Reclamation and BSWG comments due on February 4.	TBD
Adam, Danielle, Betty Roppe, Kimberley Priestley (if she agrees), Steve Johnson (if he agrees), and Kate	Review the final draft that incorporates February 4 comments from Reclamation and BSWG.	TBD
GSI	Send the revised final draft to the BSWG mailing list for review.	Close of business February 7.
All persons on the BSWG mailing list	Send to Adam, Danielle, Kate, and Mary the details of any significant issues you may have with the revised final draft. Please do not only point out problems; <i>also please suggest revised wording that would address your concerns.</i>	TBD
All persons on the BSWG mailing list	Meet to hash out any remaining significant differences, if needed.	February 11, 1 PM, Barnes-Sawyer Room at Deschutes County
GSI	Submit proposal	February 14

MEETING EVALUATION

Mary reminded the group to fill out their evaluation forms at their seats. The forms invited attendees to provide one piece of feedback about what they liked about the meeting, indicated below with a plus

symbol (+), and one piece of feedback about what they would like to change for the next meeting, indicated with a delta symbol (Δ). Below are the results. Each check mark (\checkmark) indicates that someone endorsed a previously mentioned item.

+	Δ
+ The open discussion about the various issues.	Δ Key players missing.
+ Good progress.	Δ Separate people who like to talk.
+ Very productive use of time.	Δ Keep going forward.
+ Speedy agreement on issues.	Δ Nothing.
+ Facilitator did good job keep on track.	Δ (Nothing noted)
+ Making progress on proposal.	
+ People tried really hard to follow the rules.	

The meeting adjourned.

Attachment 1

BASIN STUDY WORK GROUP: CROOKED RIVER SUBGROUP

MEMORANDUM

To: Basin Study Workgroup
From: Crooked River Subgroup
Date: January 23, 2013
Re: Report on January 22, 2103 Subgroup Meeting: Priority Questions to incorporate into Basin Study Proposal and/or Plan of Study

Background:

The Crooked River Subgroup is chaired by Betty Roppe, and is comprised of the following (anyone who attended a meeting is included):

- Betty Roppe, City of Prineville
- Dan Bruce – Terrebonne Valley Water District
- Kate Fitzpatrick – Deschutes River Conservancy
- Chris Gannon – Crooked River Watershed Council
- Kimberley Priestley- WaterWatch
- Nancy Gilbert – Fish and Wildlife Service
- Tim Hardin– Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Brett Hodgson – Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Steve Johnson – Central Oregon Irrigation District
- Mike Kasberger – Ochoco Irrigation District
- Eric Klann – City of Prineville
- Bonnie Lamb – Oregon Department of Environmental
- Peter Lickwar – Fish and Wildlife Service
- Mary Orton (facilitator) – The Mary Orton Company
- Garry Sanders – Crooked River Watershed Council
- Amy Stuart – Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Mike Britton- North Unit Irrigation District
- Steve Forrester- City of Prineville
- Brett Golden- Deschutes River Conservancy
- Mike Tripp- Trout Unlimited

Others that have been invited include the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation, Deschutes Valley Water District, NOAA Fisheries, and Crook County. The group has agreed to invite the Bureau of Land Management, the US Forest Service and the Oregon Water Resources Department. The group has met three times on the following dates: November 21, January 8 and January 22. Membership is open to any who are interested.

Direction:

The group agrees that the Basin Study will be important to help refine instream needs and water management scenarios in the lower Crooked River, Ochoco and McKay Creeks. The group has generated the following priority questions for the Basin Study:

- How much water is available for multiple uses in different water years (wet, average, dry)?

- How do we best manage this water to benefit prioritized fish species and water quality and balance multiple needs?

The group agreed, after the proposal is submitted, to address what species and reaches were highest priority. They also agreed that much research data exists already that should be referenced. In preparation for the Plan of Study, the group will also be discussing Adaptation and Mitigation Strategies they feel are important for further analysis in the Basin Study.